

## *Proposed* **Mitigated Negative Declaration**

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, the City of Grass Valley has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. On the basis of that study, the City finds that the proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and will not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report. Therefore, this Negative Declaration has been prepared.

LEAD AGENCY: City of Grass Valley  
125 East Main Street  
Grass Valley, CA. 95945

Contact: Daniel D. Chance  
Associate Planner  
(530) 274-4333

PROJECT APPLICANT: Tim and Margie DeMartini  
1305 East Main Street  
Grass Valley, CA. 95945

Contact: Andrew Cassano  
Phone: (530) 265-6911

PROJECT LOCATION: The project is located southerly of the Idaho Maryland Road, adjacent to the City of Grass Valley in Nevada County. This location corresponds to Assessor's Parcels 09-550-14 & 09-550-33.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project Development Review (04DRC-26), Annexation (05PLN-23), Prezoning (05PLN-24), and General Plan (05PLN-25) Applications for Tim DeMartini to construct a 22,000 square foot Recreational Vehicle dealership, Annexation into the City of Grass Valley, General Plan Amendment from Business Park to Commercial land use designation, and Prezoning to C-3 (Heavy Commercial) zoning district on 13.8 acres.

REVIEW PERIOD: September 2, 2005 to October 3, 2005

This application  
 Development Review Application (04DRC-26), Annexation Application (05PLN-23), Rezoning Application (05PLN-24) & General Plan Amendment Application (05PLN-25) for Tim DeMartini to construct a 22,000 square foot Recreational Vehicle dealership, Annexation into the City of Grass Valley, General Plan Amendment from Business Park to Commercial land use designation, and Rezoning to C-3 (Heavy Commercial) zoning district on 13.8 acres, located southerly of Idaho Maryland Road (APNs' 09-550-14 & -33)



## City of Grass Valley

Location Map  
 Applications 04DRC-26, 05PLN-23,  
 05PLN-24 & 05PLN-25

 Grass Valley City Limits



**CITY OF GRASS VALLEY**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

1. **04DR-26, 05PLN-23, 05PLN-24 and 04PLN-25**

2. **Lead Agency name and address:** City of Grass Valley, Community Development Department  
125 East Main Street  
Grass Valley, CA 95945

3. **Date of Initial Study Preparation: August 30, 2005**

4. **Representative:** Andrew Cassano  
Nevada City Engineering  
P.O. Box 1437  
Nevada City, CA. 95959  
(530) 265-6911

**Applicant:** Timothy and Margie DeMartini  
1305 East Main Street  
Grass Valley, CA. 95945  
Phone (530) 272-1921

5. **Description of project:** The applicant proposes construction of a 22,400 square foot, one story building southerly of Idaho Maryland Road. The intent of the structure is to provide retail and service space for a Recreational Vehicle dealership. The tenant would be "DeMartini RV Sales" occupying the building, which includes an indoor showroom, service bays, RV parts, offices and outdoor storage/display of recreational vehicles. The site is 13.80 acres in size. Building materials consist of the following: stucco walls and accent trim colors, stone slate trim, and standing seam metal roof. The project as proposed consists of the relocation of an existing business currently operating at two locations in Grass Valley.

The project includes a driveway access to the parking area from Idaho Maryland Road. The project includes 42 parking spaces. The development of the project would not require a significant amount of grading.

The development of the project identified 267,330 square feet of impervious surfaces (building area at 22,400 square feet, canopy coverage area at 7,355 square feet, and surfaced area at 237,575 square feet) and 246,678 square feet of pervious surfaces (landscaping, open space and natural areas). The development of the project would not require the removal of any trees. Access to the project would use an existing roadway from Idaho Maryland Road. A bridge for the roadway crosses Wolf Creek over a neighboring property. A replacement bridge over the creek has been approved by the Nevada County Planning Commission.

The project includes annexation into the City of Grass Valley. The property is adjacent to the City limits of Grass Valley, and is identified on the City's Sphere of Influence as being located in the 2000-2005 time horizon for annexation. The annexation does not include the access roadway to the site. The project also includes a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation from Business Park to Commercial, and Prezoning the property C-3 (Heavy Commercial) zoning district. The change of the land use designation and zoning is required to allow the recreational vehicle dealership on the property.

- 6. Surrounding land uses and setting:** The 13.80 acre site is located on the south side of Idaho Maryland Road. The site is currently vacant. The site was previously the Northstar rock quarry, which operated from the 1980's to its closure in 1999. The site was significantly impacted by the quarry operations and subsequent reclamation that took place on the site. The reclamation included a substantial amount of fill brought to the site. The reclamation created several large, level benches; with one of the benches on the project site. The site surface consists of non-native weeds and grasses over a majority of the site, with trees (consisting of pines and oaks) along the northern, down slope area near the Wolf Creek riparian area. The lot generally slopes downward to the north, to Wolf Creek. Slope gradients range two percent atop the benches to thirty percent at the north and south. Elevations range from 2,540 feet above mean sea level (MSL) on the southern property boundary, to approximately 2,470 MSL at the northern property boundary. The drainage of a majority of the site flows to the east to a detention area/settling pond located on a neighboring property.

The General Plan identifies the land use designation of the site as Business Park. The property is currently zoned CBP (Corporate Business Park) Zoning District in Nevada County. The proposed recreational vehicle dealership is inconsistent with the City of Grass Valley General Plan Land Use Designation and the Zoning Ordinance. A General Plan Amendment and Prezoning would be required as part of this project.

Access to the site is from an existing roadway from Idaho Maryland Road. The roadway includes a bridge over Wolf Creek. The applicant has received approval from Nevada County to replace the bridge. Surrounding uses consist of undeveloped land to the east, south and west, Wolf Creek and light industrial uses to the north. The project site is located adjacent to the City limits of Grass Valley. The project site is located in the City's Sphere of Influence, in the 2000 to 2005 annexation time horizon.

**7. Other public agencies whose approval is required:**

- (1) **City Encroachment Permit - Grass Valley Engineering Department (274-4350)**  
**Nevada County Department of**  
**Transportation (265-1411)**
- (2) **Sewage Disposal - Grass Valley Engineering Department (274-4350)**
- (3) **Water Connection – Nevada Irrigation District (273-6185)**
- (4) **Building Permit - Grass Valley Building Department (274-4340)**
- (5) **Grading Permit - Grass Valley Engineering Department (274-4350)**  
**Nevada County Building Department (265-1444)**

**REFERENCES:** The following references used in preparing this report has not has been attached to this report. The reference material listed below is available for review upon request of the Grass Valley Community Development Department, 125 East Main Street, Grass Valley, CA 95945 (530) 274-4330.

- o City of Grass Valley 2020 General Plan
- o City of Grass Valley 2020 General Plan EIR
- o Geotechnical Engineering Report for “DeMartini RV Sales,” Holdrege and Kull, Consulting Engineers/Geologists, prepared July 22, 2005.
- o Traffic Impact Analysis for “DeMartini Recreational Vehicle Dealership,” Roundabouts and Traffic Engineering, prepared August 15, 2005.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- \* Vicinity/Location Map
- \* Plan Package of Project
- \* Mitigation Monitoring Program

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages:

x	Land Use and Planning	x	Transportation/Circulation	x	Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/>	Population and Housing	x	Biological Resources	x	Utilities/Service Systems
x	Geological Problems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Energy/Mineral Resources	x	Aesthetics
x	Water	x	Hazards	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources
x	Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

**DETERMINATION:** On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- X I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on the attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect (s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORTS is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name \_\_\_\_\_ For Planning Division

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

- 1) A brief explanation is generally provided for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as operational impacts.
- 3) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is

required.

- 4) “Negative Declaration: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses”, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVII at the end of the checklist.

<b>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:</b>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. <i>Would the proposal:</i></b>				
a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?			X	
b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?			X	
c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?			X	
d) Affect agricultural resources or operation (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)				X
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community?				X

**I. LAND USE AND PLANNING RESPONSES:**

**Impact Discussions:** The project consists of a 22,400 square foot recreational vehicle dealership and service center. The General Plan land use designation for the property is Business Park. The property is currently zoned CBP (Corporate Business Park) zoning district in Nevada County, and with the annexation the property would be rezoned to implement the City’s zoning district consistent with the General Plan designation. The 13.80 acre lot with a proposed recreational vehicle dealership would be inconsistent with the Business Park land use designation as identified in the 2020 General Plan.

The project includes an annexation to the City of Grass Valley. The property is adjacent to the City limits of Grass Valley, and is identified on the City’s Sphere of Influence as being located in the 2000-2005 time horizon for annexation.

The project includes a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation from Business Park to Commercial. In addition, the project includes Rezoning the property to the C-3 (Heavy Commercial) zoning district. The change of the land use designation and zoning is required to allow the recreational vehicle dealership on the property. Review of neighboring land use designations identifies a large area to the west and south-west with a General Plan designation of Commercial. The General Plan describes the intent of the Business Park designation to accommodate a variety of employment-generating land uses in a master-planned, campus-type setting, designed to preserve and enhance the natural environment and to be full integrated into the larger community. Employment types include a full range of industrial and commercial land uses, but does not include a recreational vehicle dealership. The zoning designations consistent with the Business Park land use designation include the CBP (Corporate Business Park), OP (Office Professional) and I/S

(Industrial/Services) zoning districts which allow retail uses associated with, and accessory to, businesses in the immediate area. The I/S (Industrial/Services) zoning district does allow uses that include service, maintenance and repair, however the retail use associated with the RV dealership is not allowed. The constraints associated with the current location of the properties limit the integration into the larger community. The Commercial designation is intended to provide a wide variety of commercial and commercial service establishments in a variety of locations that would include a recreational vehicle dealership. The change in the land use designation is required to allow the proposed recreational vehicle dealership. The amendment would be consistent with the land use designations with neighborhood development patterns to the west and south. A General Plan Amendment shall consider a land use change upon a finding that the change is consistent with the following General Plan elements:

- Land Use
- Circulation
- Conservation
- Noise
- Safety
- Community Design
- Historical
- Recreation

Staff review of the proposed General Plan Amendment determined the change of land use is consistent with the intent of City’s General Plan. The vision of the General Plan includes diversity of the economy and the location of industry and business to avoid undue traffic impacts. The vision statement also concludes that over the twenty year life span of the General Plan, fine tuning shall take place that enhance the goals of the City. The goals of the Grass Valley General Plan encourages diversity of land uses, as well as identifying areas for new clustered commercial uses to fill “niches” not otherwise filled. Land Use Objectives 18-21 discuss supporting the expansion and retention of existing businesses, expanding the local tax base, and improving employment opportunities.

Review of the proposed project determined no significant increase in provided services or an impact on existing infrastructure. The proposed RV dealership is consistent with land use that has taken place in the immediate area. Recent development in the immediate area includes Weaver Automotive, a car dealership and other heavy commercial development in the eastern portion of Grass Valley. The RV dealership is specialized consisting of 90 percent of the business taking place on the internet, and provided delivery of recreational vehicles. The RV dealership, as proposed at this location has the potential of reducing vehicular trips in the immediate area, compared to other uses that could take place in the Commercial or Business Park land use designations. The General Plan amendment associated with this project does not significantly impact employment opportunities and significantly reduces vehicle trips as compared to other allowed commercial and business park uses. The analysis of both land uses determined that the trip generation and PM peak hour vehicle would be relatively the same, whether Business Park or Commercial land use. The City supports the land use change to commercial based on the above analysis; the City would discourage the change of commercial use of the property that may impact traffic at nearby intersections.

The change in land use associated with this project will not significantly impact traffic circulation in the immediate area. Existing uses within Business Parks in the immediate area include manufacturing, light industrial, general office and medical office uses. Listed below in Table 1 are the P.M. peak hour trips for the 22,400 square foot building for allowed uses under the existing zoning, as well as the proposed RV dealership:

Table 1

<b>Business Park</b>		<b>Commercial</b>	
General Office	103 PM peak trips	RV Dealership	8 PM peak trips
Medical Office	70 PM peak trips		
Light Industrial	24 PM peak trips		

The City of Grass Valley is currently preparing an Economic and Fiscal Impact Analysis to evaluate the market/fiscal/job-housing impacts associated with proposed land use changes being contemplated for the Special

Development Areas (SDA's). Since this project also contemplates removing some Business Park designated land, the report may provide some applicable information for the City to consider. The study concludes revenue generated from Commercial land uses is higher than Business Park land uses, and the land use change reduces the fiscal impact on the City. In addition, the utilities and services are adjacent to the site and will not require the additional cost of extending services. The Phase II portion of the Fiscal Impact Analysis indicated a change to commercial will not have a fiscal impact on the City.

**Impact:** The proposed change in the land use designation reduces the overall amount of acres dedicated to Business Park. This could have the potential of reducing the employment opportunities associated with the Business Park designation in the City of Grass Valley. The commercial use as proposed provides employment opportunities. Of the total site, only 6.1 acres of the 13.80 acre site is expected to be developed due to topography constraints.

Review of the proposed General Plan Amendment determined the change of land use is consistent with the intent of City's General Plan. The vision the General Plan includes diversity of the economy and the location of industry and business to avoid undue traffic impacts. The General Plan discusses allowing better use of existing resources and encourages revitalization of the City. The proposed amendment is consistent with the General Plan which supports the expansion and retention of existing businesses, expanding the local tax base, and improving employment opportunities.

The intent of the C-3 (Heavy Commercial) zoning district is intended to be applied where general commercial facilities are necessary for public service and convenience. The RV dealership is expected to attract customers from a wide region. The proposed use associated with internet sales and customer delivery, will not generate significant traffic by the proposed project, and is not anticipated to significantly impact any identified critical intersections or exceed adopted traffic thresholds. Review of the proposed project determined no significant increase in public services or an impact on existing infrastructure.

No significant impact on land use is anticipated with this project. No mitigation measures would be required for the land use section.

<b>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:</b>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the proposal:</i></b>				
a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?				X
b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?				X
c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?				X

**II. POPULATION AND HOUSING RESPONSES:**

**Impact Discussions:** The project proposes a commercial development. No significant impact on housing and population is anticipated with this project. No mitigation measures would be required for the population and housing section.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>III. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS.</b> <i>Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:</i>				
a) Fault rupture?			X	
b) Seismic ground shaking?			X	
c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?				X
e) Landslides or mudslides?				X
f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?			X	
g) Subsidence of land?				X
h) Expansive soils?				X
i) Unique geologic or physical features?				X

**III. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS RESPONSES:**

**Environmental Setting:** The 13.80 acre site is located on the south side of Idaho Maryland Road. The site is currently vacant. The site was previously the Northstar rock quarry, which operated from the 1980's to its closure in 1999. The site was significantly impacted by the quarry operations and subsequent reclamation that took place on the site. The reclamation included a substantial amount of fill brought to the site. The reclamation created several large, level benches; with one of the benches on the project site. The Nevada County Soil Survey identifies the soil on the property as "Rock Outcrop –Dubakella Complex,." The erosion hazard with this site is moderate to high depending on slope, and permeability is slow. There are no identified active fault lines on the property. The City of Grass Valley is located in the low intensity zone for earthquake severity.

A Geotechnical Engineering Report was prepared by Holdrege & Kull in July of 2005. The report identified historic placer diggings took place in the northeast corner of the property. The report also identified the site coincides with the Morehouse claim, which was a portion of the Idaho-Maryland Consolidated Mines. Review of historical mining information did not identify shafts or ore processing facilities located on the project site. The report did identify the site was used as a rock quarry which ceased operation in 1999. The reclamation of the site included the importation of a significant amount of fill to the site. The fill has been tested for compaction by Holdrege & Kull, who have added that the compaction was adequate for the reclamation of the site, however further compaction testing would be required for the proposed development. The report concluded that the site is suitable for the proposed improvements, with the incorporation of the recommendations and design criteria as described in the report. The development of the site requires implementation of the geotechnical recommendations as part of the building and grading permits to insure the development would not result in exposing people or property to geologic hazards such as ground failure, or similar hazards.

The lot generally slopes downward to the north towards Wolf Creek. The average gradient of the site is 1% to 5% slopes for the bench (a previously graded area) and 15% to 30% on the sloped areas. The proposed building and parking areas are located on the bench. The development of the project requires very little grading, for the utilities and structure foundation.

The Geotechnical Engineering Report referenced the Geologic Map of the Grass Valley –Colfax Area which identified the site as Mesozoic age, ultramafic serpentinite of the Lake Combie Complex. Serpentinite rock has a high potential of containing naturally occurring asbestiform minerals (asbestos). An asbestos dust mitigation plan will be required with the project. The potential hazards associated with asbestos is addressed in Section 9, Hazards.

**Impact:** The project as proposed may have short-term and long-term geologic impacts. The short-term impacts would include erosion associated with grading and development of the project. Adequate measures should be incorporated into the grading plan to minimize this short-term risk. The long term impacts would include potential impacts to the structures from settling due to inappropriate compaction or soils. Implementation of the recommendations in the geotechnical report address these issues to a less than significant impact.

**1. Mitigation Measure:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the developer shall post a cash bond with the City for erosion and temporary drainage and/or sedimentation control of the project site as determined appropriate by the City Engineer. A detailed grading, permanent erosion control and landscaping plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Engineering Department, prior to commencing site grading. Erosion control measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans.

**2. Mitigation Measures:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a detailed engineering plan shall be prepared for the site to accommodate project development. Geotechnical measures shall be incorporated into project grading and construction. The detailed engineering plan shall be incorporated into project grading and construction, which would provide further detailed review by the geotechnical engineer, consistent with the geotechnical report.

<b>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:</b>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>IV. WATER.</b> <i>Would the proposal result in:</i>				
a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?		X		
b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?				X
c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)?			X	
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?			X	
e) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?			X	
f) Changes in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?				X
g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?			X	
h) Impacts to groundwater quality?			X	
i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?				X

**IV. WATER RESPONSES:**

**Environmental Setting:** The 13.80 acre site is located on the south side of Idaho Maryland Road. The site is currently vacant. The site was previously the Northstar rock quarry, which operated from the 1980’s to its closure in 1999. The site was significantly impacted by the quarry operations and subsequent reclamation that took place on the site. The reclamation included a substantial amount of fill brought to the site. The reclamation created several large, level benches; with one of the benches representing the project site. The FIRM map produced by the Federal Emergency Management Agency did not identify the project site as being located in the 100-year floodplain. The development of the project identified 267,330 square feet of impervious surfaces (building area at 22,400 square feet, canopy coverage area at 7355 square feet, and surfaced area at 237,575 square feet) which equates to approximately 44% of the 601,128 square foot project site. With the additional impervious surfaces, the project may result in increased concentrated storm water runoff. As identified in the Geologic section, the “Rock Outcrop –Dubakella Complex” soil on the property has a slow permeability. With the slow permeability of the soil, along with the importation and compaction of soil associated with the reclamation of the site, stormwater run-off from the site may not significantly change with this project. However, the project would include new stormwater drainage improvements as part of the project. The project includes stormwater detention vaults in the southeast corner of the property. A majority of the stormwater from the developed areas will be directed to flow into the stormwater detention facilities. The stormwater detention facilities would be designed so as to maintain pre-development stormwater runoff. The stormwater runoff from the site has historically flowed to a detention pond on a neighboring property to the southeast. A NPDES Permits will be required for the onsite detention facility.

**Impact:** The project would include directing on-site runoff into the Wolf Creek watershed. The runoff from the site may contain grease, oil and other petroleum by-product, as well as other sediments that may have the potential of impacting the Wolf Creek watershed. The City would require grease, oil and other petroleum by-product separators be installed at the drainage inlets to prevent the pollutants from entering the stormwater detention area. The project may have short term impacts associated with sediment and run off during grading and construction. The project will be required to incorporate “Best Management Practices” (BMP’s) during the development of the property.

**3. Mitigation Measure:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a detailed engineered drainage plan shall be submitted for the review and approval by the City Engineer. The drainage plan shall be designed so that off-site concentrated storm water flows will resemble pre-development conditions for a model storm event as determined by the City Engineer. Drainage improvements shall be constructed in accordance with the with the approved engineered drainage plan. The site drainage system shall incorporate sand/oil separators, or other approved methods to prevent site contaminants impacting the Wolf Creek watershed.

**4. Mitigation Measure:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a detailed engineered drainage plan shall incorporate “Best Management Practices” to address short-term impacts of on-site sediments, including silt, sand and mud flowing into the Wolf Creek drainage during construction. This plan shall provide approved methods to keep sediment disturbed during construction, and approved by the City Engineer.

<b>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:</b>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:</b>				
a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air				X

<b>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:</b>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
quality violation?				
b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?			X	
c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?				X
d) Create objectionable odors?				X

**V. AIR QUALITY**

**Environmental Setting:** The 13.80 acre site is located on the south side of Idaho Maryland Road. The site is currently vacant. The site was previously the Northstar rock quarry, which operated from the 1980’s to its closure in 1999. The site was significantly impacted by the quarry operations and subsequent reclamation that took place on the site. The reclamation included a substantial amount of fill brought to the site. The reclamation created several large, level benches; with one of the benches representing the project site.

**Impact Discussions:** The project could have a potential to create short-term air quality impacts associated with construction of the project. Dust generated by grading could have the potential of impacting the air quality. The project would generate a small increase of traffic which would not result in significant increased vehicle emissions. Also grading and construction activities would generate dust and particles. The project is located within the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District (NSAQMD). Preliminary review of the project by the NSAQMD determined the project may have short term impacts associated with the construction of the project, however, the long term impacts of the project will likely be below the District’s level of significance. The NSAQMD has submitted preliminary recommendations in order to mitigate short-term emissions to a level below significant for air quality impacts. The project will be circulated to the NSAQMD to determine whether further mitigation is needed.

The NSAQMD would require review of a detailed air quality analysis for potential emissions from the project to determine cumulative air quality impacts. The district would review the project for the potential of exceeding emission thresholds. The District has developed a tiered approach to Emission Thresholds of Significance. Those tiers are divided into three areas. If the project exceeds 136 pounds per day of NOx, ROG and PM10, then the project would be equal to or greater than the third tier, and have a significant impact on the air quality, and would require appropriate mitigation measures.

It is noted that the project site has been identified for containing ultramafic or serpentine rock. Such soils have naturally-occurring asbestos. As part of Section IX, Mitigation Measure 7, addresses the requirement that if these materials are identified on the property, an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan would need to be submitted to the NSAQMD and approved by the District before grading and construction operations commence.

Preliminary review of the project by the NSAQMD determined that the long term impacts from the project will likely be below the District’s level of significance.

The development of the property could have the potential of significantly impacting air quality during construction, and be mitigated with the following requirements to further reduce air quality impacts:

**5. Mitigation Measure:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a Dust Mitigation Plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District and City Engineer. Dust mitigation measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Dust Mitigation Plan. The dust mitigation plan shall include the following:

- The applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that all adequate dust control measures are implemented in a timely manner during all phases of project development and construction.
- All material excavated, stockpiled, or graded shall be sufficiently watered, treated, or covered to prevent dust from leaving the property boundaries and causing a public nuisance or a violation of an ambient air standard. Watering should occur at least twice daily, with complete site coverage.
- All land clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation activities on the project shall be suspended as necessary to prevent excessive windblown dust when winds are expected to exceed 20 mph.
- All inactive portions of the development site shall be covered, seeded, or watered until a suitable cover is established. Alternatively, the applicant shall be responsible for applying City approved non-toxic soil stabilizers (according to manufactures specifications) to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas which remain inactive for 96 hours) in accordance with the local grading ordinance.
- All areas with vehicle traffic shall be watered or have dust palliative applied as necessary for regular stabilization of dust emissions.
- All material transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent public nuisance.
- Paved streets adjacent to the project shall be swept or washed at the end of each day, or as required to remove excessive accumulations of silt and/or mud which may have resulted from activities at the project site.
- No burning of waste material or vegetation shall take place on-site.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION.</b> <i>Would the proposal create:</i>				
a) Increase vehicle trips or traffic congestion?			X	
b) hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?			X	
c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?				X
d) Insufficient parking capacity onsite or offsite?			X	
e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?				X
f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X
g) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?				X

**VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION RESPONSES:**

**Impact Discussions:** The project consists of a 22,400 square foot, one story building located southerly of Idaho Maryland Road. The intent of the structure is to provide retail and service space for a recreational vehicle dealership. The recreational vehicle dealership is a specialized use with 90 percent of the business taking place on the internet, as well as providing delivery of the recreational vehicles. The use would not create a significant number of vehicle trips into the site. Review by City Staff and the Traffic Engineer determined the RV dealership as proposed would not generate the number of vehicle trips an automobile dealership would generate. However, the trip generation for an RV dealership is not identified in the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) handbook. As defined by the City’s “Traffic Studies and Traffic Mitigation,” since there are no traffic generation numbers for a recreational vehicle dealership in the

ITE handbook, an analysis can be prepared using recent traffic volume counts of similar existing uses. A traffic analysis was prepared on August 15, 2005, by Roundabouts & Traffic Engineering that took counts at the two current locations operated as an RV dealership and service by the applicant “DeMartini RV Sales.” The engineer evaluated the number of PM peak hour trips expected from the new facilities. The analysis determined the RV dealership is expected to generate 8 PM peak hour trips. The project site is located in close proximity to the State Highway 20/49 eastbound and Idaho Maryland Road intersection as well as the East Main Street, Idaho Maryland Road and State Highway 20/49 intersection which are two identified critical intersections. The number of 8 PM peak hour trips would not have a significant impact on those intersections, as defined in the City of Grass Valley Policy, “Traffic Impact Study Methodology and Evaluation Criteria for Critical Intersections.”

The City has evaluated the project for parking demand for the RV sales and service which is proposing 42 parking spaces, as well as additional parking spaces in the RV display area. Under the Parking Ordinance for motor vehicle sales and service (1 per 800 square feet) and one parking space for each employee (10 employees), the required parking would be 35 spaces.

With implementation of the collection of the payment of City and Regional traffic impact fees that fund necessary intersection improvements at identified critical Intersections, the project would not have a significant impact on the transportation and circulation in the area and region.

<b>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:</b>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> <i>Would the proposal result in impacts to:</i>				
a) Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?			X	
b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)?				X
c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?			X	
d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian, and vernal pool)?				X
e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?				X

**VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES RESPONSES:**

**Impact Discussions:** The project is located on 13.8 acres. The site is currently vacant. The majority of the project site consists of significantly disturbed soils. The site surface consists of non-native weeds and grasses over a majority of the site, with some tree cover (consisting of pine and oak) along the northern portion of the property near Wolf Creek. No wetlands or riparian habitats have been identified on the development site. On April 6, 2005, Nevada County approved a Use Permit for a replacement bridge of Wolf Creek. The Mitigated Negative Declaration for that project identified wetlands adjacent to the roadway, as well as impacts to Wolf Creek riparian habitat. The mitigation measures adopted with the bridge include requirements for all work in the Wolf Creek riparian habitat, as well as criteria for the widening of the roadway adjacent to the wetland.

**Proposed Project**

The implementation of the proposed project would require disturbance to the project site, including vegetation clearing, grading, paving, and trenching associated with site preparation, roadway construction, and building construction. Grading and construction is proposed to occur on ±267,300 square feet of the project site.

**Potential Impacts**

The proposed development will not have a significant impact on natural vegetation and wildlife habitats. The location of the development as proposed is located on the former quarry site, with only non-native grasses within that area. The forested area is located along the steeper portions of the property at the northern portion of the property, and would remain undisturbed. The site has been significantly disturbed over time reducing the potential for special status plant species on-site. There is a potential for raptors creating nests in the trees on the property along Wolf Creek. Mitigation Measure 6 requires that surveys be conducted for these nesting raptors prior to issuance of a grading permit. Should any raptors be found to exist on any of the two lots, additional mitigation measures would be developed prior to issuance of any grading permits, which includes no construction during the nesting season. The grading and development of the site associated with the project should ensure the protection of the forested area along the southern portion of the property. The mitigation measure below provides the necessary protection of those remaining trees in the area.

A wetland was identified adjacent to the roadway to the project site. The wetland was identified during the approval of the bridge by the Nevada County Planning Commission. Additionally, the applicant shall be required to satisfy the Mitigation Measures and conditions of approval from Nevada County which requires appropriate review by California Department of Fish and Game and United States Army Corp of Engineers for all development in or adjacent to wetlands and riparian habitat; and ensure that the road widening will be located outside of the identified wetlands and not impacting said wetlands. With the implementation of those previous Mitigation Measures and conditions from the County, the project will not have an impact on those identified wetlands.

The City of Grass Valley General Plan recognizes the importance of preserving significant natural resources, including flora and fauna. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in the degradation of wildlife habitat or the removal of more than two acres of native vegetation. These impacts are not considered significant. The project may have a potential of impacting nesting raptors in the trees adjacent to Wolf Creek. A mitigation measure has been added to address the potential of impacting nesting raptors during the construction of the project. Implementation of the City of Grass Valley’s standard conditions of approval will help mitigate impacts to biological resources at the project site.

**6. Mitigation Measure:** Surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist for any nesting raptors within the proposed development area. All surveys shall be completed prior to issuance of a grading permit. Should any special status species or nesting raptors be found onsite, the project applicant shall work with the California Department of Fish and Game and/or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to establish appropriate mitigation measures to avoid or lessen any impacts to special status species. If necessary, the project applicant and the California Department of Fish and Game and/or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service shall establish a mitigation program, which shall be submitted to the City of Grass Valley Planning Division for approval prior to issuance of a grading permit for the project site. If any nesting raptors are found onsite, the mitigation program shall include preservation of active nest trees.

<b>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:</b>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the proposal:</i></b>				
a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?				X
b) Use nonrenewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?				X

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
c) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?				X

**VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES RESPONSES:**

**Impact Discussions:** The project is expected to result in the use of timber, metal, petroleum products and other natural resources for the proposed site improvements. No significant impact on Energy/Resource use is anticipated. No mitigation measures would be required for the energy and mineral resource section.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>IX. HAZARDS.</b> <i>Would the proposal involve:</i>				
a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation)?				X
b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
c) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?			X	
d) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?			X	
e) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?				X

**IX. HAZARDS:**

**Impact Discussions:** The development of the commercial structure on the site is not expected to result in a risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances as long as proper construction methods are used. Construction methods will be monitored by the Building Department during construction.

The project site has the potential of having naturally occurring serpentine, ultramafic rock or naturally occurring asbestos. An Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan would need to be submitted to the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District (NSAQMD) and approved by the District before grading and construction operations commence. If serpentine, ultramafic rock or naturally occurring asbestos are identified on the property, implementation of the Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan would reduce the potential risk to human health to an acceptable level.

With the implementation of the mitigation measure, if necessary, the project would not have a significant impact associated with health hazards.

**7. Mitigation Measure:** If naturally occurring asbestos is located onsite, the project developer shall prepare an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan pursuant to CCR Title 17 Section 93105. The Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan shall include the provisions of the Construction Emission, Asbestos Dust, Fugitive Dust, and Erosion Control Plan. The Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan shall also include any additional measures required by the State of California or the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District. The Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan shall be approved by the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District prior to issuance of any grading permits.

<b>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:</b>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>X. NOISE.</b> <i>Would the proposal result in:</i>				
a) Increases in existing noise levels?				X
b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?				X

**X. NOISE:**

**Impact Discussions:** The project site is not located near any noise sensitive land uses nor considered a noise sensitive land uses. No significant noise impacts are expected during project construction.

No significant impact on noise is anticipated with this project. No mitigation measures would be required for the noise section.

<b>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:</b>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>XI. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> <i>Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:</i>				
a) Fire protection?				X
b) Police protection?				X
c) Schools?				X
d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?				X
e) Other government services?				X

**XI. PUBLIC SERVICES RESPONSES:**

**Impact Discussions:** The project is located outside of the city limits of Grass Valley, and would require expansion of the service boundaries of the City. The project would be served by the City of Grass Valley fire and police protection.

With proper fire prevention measure the project is not expected to significantly impact Fire Department services. Payment of new development fees will address the project's impact on City Fire and Police Department Services.

No significant impact on public services is anticipated with this project. No mitigation measures would be required for the public services section.

<b>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:</b>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> <i>Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:</i>				
a) Power or natural gas?				X
b) Communications systems?				X
c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?				X
d) Sewer or septic tanks?				X
e) Storm water drainage?				X
f) Solid waste disposal?				X
g) Local or regional water supplies				X

**XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE RESPONSES:**

**Impact Discussions:** The project as proposed would require underground utilities and existing overhead lines would be underground.

The project site is located within the NID (Nevada Irrigation District) exclusion area and is entitled to water. The project would not significantly reduce the supply of water in the City of Grass Valley and Nevada County area.

The project would be connected through the City's sewer system. The City has approved development projects involving potential increased demands on the City's waste water treatment plant, recognizing the potential limits on sewer availability. The commercial development associated with a recreational vehicle dealership is expected to generate a small demand on sewer service. Sufficient sewer treatment capacity will be required before the project is allowed to be constructed and/or connected to the City's sewer system. A recent expansion of the sewer plant capacity from 1.72 to 2.78 MGD (million gallons per day), provides adequate sewer capacity for the proposed project. However, specific approval to connect to the sewer system must be obtained from the City at the time of building permit issuance. A sewer study analyzing downstream sewer pipe capacities will be required.

No significant impact on utilities is anticipated with this project. No mitigation measures would be required for the utility services section.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>XIII. AESTHETICS.</b> <i>Would the proposal:</i>				
a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?				X
b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect ?				X
c) Create light or glare?			X	

**XIII. AESTHETICS:**

**Environmental Setting:** The project site is vacant and dominated by non-native grasses, with trees scattered along the hillside near Wolf Creek. Evidence of a previous quarry and subsequent reclamation was observed, including a large graded bench area. The project is located on a hillside southerly of Idaho Maryland Road and Wolf Creek in the eastern portion of Grass Valley. The project would be visible from State Highway 20/49.

**Impact Discussion:** The General Plan’s Conservation/Open Space Element includes a discussion about the 1972 and 1982 General Plans establishing Highway 49/20 as a scenic highway. The 1972 General Plan proposed policies prohibiting billboards and off-premise signs, and encouraged landscaping and tree planting along scenic corridors. The 1982 General Plan reinforced those policies and efforts through new policies designed to enhance City “entryways”. The plan also identified the need to address viewsheds, specifically, prominent hills and ridgelines. The 1999 General Plan states the City has implemented some aspects of scenic highway/entryway and hillside/ridgeline provisions through the zoning and design guidelines. However, the adopted policies focus on further implementing viewshed protection measures. The project has a potential of creating visual impacts to highway motorists created by the buildings, recreational vehicles and lights.

The City’s Design Guidelines identifies the Idaho-Maryland Road area as a Special Planning Area. This section states “The design emphasis for Idaho Maryland Road shall concentrate on aesthetically pleasing structures, and screening of unsightly areas from public view through the use of natural landscaping.” Three of the four specific policies apply to this project. Two relates to improving the landscaping to buffer, soften and screen the views from along Idaho-Maryland Road and Highway 49/20. The third policy requires building designs to be attractive, interesting, and safe and shall reflect the character of Grass Valley. It also emphasizes attention to detail in the building articulation.

The proposed project located in a previously graded bench. The landscape plan proposed along this area includes large trees along the northern portion of the bench, which include Raywood Ash (a fast growing, deciduous tree, that grows 25 to 35 ft. in height), Chinese Pistache (a moderate growing, deciduous tree, that grows to 60 ft. in height), and Cork Oak (a moderate growing, evergreen tree, that grows to 100 ft. in height). The trees at this location, as well as other shrubs, on the proposed landscape plan will provide a significant buffer and visual screen to most of the site once the plants begin to mature. The landscape plan identifies additional trees located through-out the property, providing additional screening, as well as, breaking up those public views. The project would be conditioned to provide a final landscape plan for the project, which would provide screening from those identified public views.

The plan includes nine parking lot and driveway street lights, with one attached to the building and lights under the canopy. The height of the light poles are twenty feet and consistent with the City’s Community Design Guidelines. The applicant provided a photometric plan showing lighting on the site and at the property lines. The light spillage is generally less than 1 foot candle; however, some of the light spillage is greater than 7 in some spots. The City’s Design Guidelines establish a maximum lighting spill over of 0.5 foot candles at any point on properties containing residences, churches, or other sensitive uses. None of these uses exist in the area. The City’s Design Guidelines state lighting levels shall be limited to the minimum necessary to provide public safety. The project would be conditioned to provide a

photometric plan that includes down cast lighting to reduce light spillage, glare and reflection.

The project as proposed would be consistent with the Grass Valley Community Design Guidelines and the Community Design Element of the General Plan. With implementation of the of the City’s standard conditions for landscaping and street lighting, the project would not have a significant impact associated with aesthetics. No mitigation measures would be required for the aesthetics section.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> <i>Would the proposal:</i>				
a) Disturb paleontological resources?				X
b) Disturb archaeological resources?			X	
c) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?				X
d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?				X

**XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES RESPONSES:**

**Impact Discussions:** The site is currently vacant but shows signs of having been significantly disturbed. The General Plan identifies the cultural sensitivity of the property as moderate to low. Past development/grading has disturbed the property reducing the potential for cultural resources on the property. The CEQA guidelines does require, as part of the objectives, criteria and procedures required by section 21082 of Public Resources Code, a lead agency should make provisions if historical or unique archaeological resources accidentally discovered during construction. A condition of approval would be added to address if cultural resources are identified on the property consistent with the cultural and historic element of the General Plan.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>XV. RECREATION.</b> <i>Would the proposal:</i>				
a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?				X
b) Affect existing recreational opportunities?				X

**XV. RECREATION RESPONSES:**

**Impact Discussions:**

No significant impact on recreation is anticipated with this project. No mitigation measures would be required for the recreation section.

<b>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:</b>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number of restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?				X
c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)				X
d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly?				X

**XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

**Impact Discussions:** As stated in the sections above in the Transportation Section, the project would generate an additional 8 peak hour trips which adds to the long-term cumulative impact on traffic, along with future development in the area, in the City of Grass Valley and the regional area. To mitigate this impact the project shall be subject to payment of the City and Regional traffic impact fees. Those fees would be used to provide improvements to identified critical intersections. With those fees, the project would have a less than significant cumulative impact on the City of Grass Valley and the regional area. As described in the above analysis, this project will result in less than significant impacts.